

REMARKS

After entry of this amendment, claims 1 – 34 will be pending in this application. Claims 32 -34 are new. Claims 1-24 and 31 have been allowed. Applicant wishes to express his gratitude to the Examiner for the allowance of these claims.

The Amendments

Applicant has amended the specification to correct a typographical error (para. 0025), and to clarify a few points (paras. 8, 35 and 36). Support for the amendment of paragraph 8 can be found at original paragraphs 11 and 33 of the specification, as well as in original claims 1, 9, 19, 25 and 27. The amendment of paragraphs 35 and 36 is intended to alleviate any confusion about the nature of the liquid crystal material that can be used to practice the invention, i.e., the liquid crystal material need not be flexible. Flexibility is merely one embodiment. Support for this amendment can be found in original paragraph 35.

Claim 27 has been amended to correct an error in dependency. Claim 28 has been amended to address the 112/2 rejection. New dependent claims 32 and 33 have been added to clarify the scope of the independent claims to which they refer. Support for new claims 32 and 33 can be found at paras. 33 and 34. New claim 34 has been added in view of the 112/2 rejection and the corresponding amendment of claim 28.

The Rejections

Claims 25, 28 and 30 stand rejected. Reconsideration of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested in view of the below remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claim 28 under 35 USC. 112/2 as being indefinite for use of the words “such as.” Claim 28 has been amended to remove the language “such as a transponder.” New dependent claim 34 now recites this limitation.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 25, 28 and 30 over Williams 764. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims patentably define over Williams. Applicant will address the rejection of these claims over Williams insofar as independent claim 25 is concerned, and need not address its dependent claims 28 and 30. By doing so, Applicant does not concede that Williams teaches the additional subject matter recited by these claims (particularly in combination with claim 25).

Claim 25 recites, in relevant part, that the adapter “prevents the motion detector from providing an indication of motion in a protected space to an alarm panel....” This feature of claim 25 is not taught or suggested by Williams. In fact, Applicant submits that Williams’ teachings are antithetical to this feature.

As Applicant pointed out in his Appeal Brief (pp. 4 -5) filed in the parent application, Williams teaches a “dynamically bypassed zone” system, where the alarm panel *does* receive the “breach indication”, even in the presence of a transmitted signal from his portable device 22. In the presence of a signal from the portable device, the alarm panel treats the zone in which the breach occurred as a bypassed zone. Thus, the alarm panel still receives the breach indication from the device that created it, but, in the presence of a signal from the portable device, the alarm panel does not cause an alarm. In Williams’ jargon, that zone has been “dynamically bypassed” *at the alarm panel*.

What the signal from Williams’ portable device does is far different from what Applicant claims. Claim 25 is clear that the signal from the motion detector is prevented from being provided to the alarm panel in response to the authorization signal. Applicant therefore respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion at paragraph 4 of the Office Action that Williams discloses the claimed feature. For this reason alone, Applicant submits that claim 25 is not taught or suggested by Williams


The Examiner asserts that Williams also teaches or suggests other features of claim 25. In view of the foregoing, Applicant need not address these assertions, and does not concede to the them.

DOCKET NO.: BNWL-0006
Application No.: 10/613,699
Office Action Dated: June 30, 2005

PATENT

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the present Office Action, and a Notice of Allowance of all pending claims, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven J. Rocci
Registration No. 30,489

Date: September 2, 2005

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439